

Message

---

**From:** Josephson, Ron [Josephson.Ron@epa.gov]  
**Sent:** 11/9/2018 5:44:48 PM  
**To:** Grifo, Francesca [Grifo.Francesca@epa.gov]; Otto, Martha [Otto.Martha@epa.gov]; D'Arcy, Daniel [darcy.daniel@epa.gov]; Cogliano, Vincent [cogliano.vincent@epa.gov]  
**Subject:** EPA Communications Documents  
**Attachments:** EPA\_Product\_Review\_Process\_guidelines.pdf; Handbook Feb 2015.pdf; ord\_ppm\_chapter\_14\_3\_final\_9.16.2016.pdf

To All:

I spoke with our office's communications director about the last review issue. She told me that many aspects of scientific review are already incorporated into ORD communications strategies. I am attaching some documents concerning ORD and Agency communications procedures. One of the (Chapter 14 of the ORD Policies and Procedures Manual) specifically references Scientific Integrity Officials as well.

EPA\_Product\_Review\_Process\_guidelines.pdf  
Handbook Feb 2015.pdf  
ord\_ppm\_chapter\_14\_3\_final\_9.16.2016.pdf

It is likely that Agency procedures would need to be "tweaked" to accommodate the idea that an actual research author or co-author should be consulted on products that are published by the agency, but the attached documents really do seem to take into account consultations with subject matter experts, anyway. There might also be issues of National Program Directors taking the lead on scientific responses without researchers being consulted. That might be an issue to be brought up to managers as well as communication directors. Much of our instruction, at least in ORD, parallels or even provides more detail than what was in the NOAA documents. Clearly, EPA structure is a bit different from NOAA, which accounts for some of the difference.

I wanted to bring all this to your attention to make sure I am on the right track and because I was not sure how aware you were of these documents (available on ORD and other Intranet sites). Please let me know what you think.

Ron